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802.1CBdb Draft 1.2 summary

- P802.1CBdb draft 1.2 was prepared for 1st WG recirc ballot. Changes to D1.1 include:
  - 802.1CB’s maintenance items: implementation of missing part of item #274 and correction of misinterpreted part of #257
  - Change of msdu mask maximum length value to 1984 bytes, reflected in MIB and YANG;
  - Correction of MIB syntax errors;
  - Highlighting of CBdb’s MIB additions in CBcv’s MIB revision
  - Various editorial corrections in the text, MIB and YANG module.
  - Annexes renumbering
  - Removal of most of the editor’s notes
Ballot statistics

• 58 respondents (81.7% of voting members)
  – Approve: 36 (85.7%)
  – Disapprove: 6
  – Abstain: 14

• 32 comments from 6 commenters
  – TR: 7
  – T: 2
  – ER: 15
Comments not to be discussed

• Editorial
  – Typos, conventions, cross-references, editor’s instructions/notes, reference updates
    • 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29.
    • Accept, Accept in principle

• Technical
  – Changes in CBcv D1.1’s YANG not integrated in CBdb D1.2’s
    • « Stream-identity-list » changed into « stream-identity »
      – 1, 10
      – Accept in principle
    • Identification type container added to the stream id function container
      – 32
      – Accept
Comments to be discussed

• Technical + editorial: YANG
  – 15: which MAC address format to use?
    • Already agreed on using hex format instead of 48-bit integer for MAC address mask and match nodes,
    • … but which hex format: ieee, ietf, (new) normalized?
  – 26: MAC address format used in Annex D (examples)
    • Byte separator + case: align on (agreed-on) YANG format?
  – 16: msdu mask and match nodes encoded as ieee-like hex-strings
    • Proposal for an ieee-like hex-represented octet string.
  – 17: prefix not required in RFC 7950 whereas required by YANG tool(s?)
    • in the derived-from-or-self() XPath function’s second parameter
Comments to be discussed

• Editorial + technical: CBcv sync
  – 9, 11: consequence of CBdb being an amendment to CB as amended by CBcv
    • Missing instruction to introduce the change to CBcv’s MIB
  – 8, 13, 14: what is new, what is a change to CBcv?
    • New tables or changes to tables defined in CBcv?
  – 30, 31: conformance clauses (5.8, 5.11) initially changed by CBdb are now also modified by CBcv
  – 12: relationship to other YANG modules
    • Similar comment made against CBcv D1.1: changes requested by the comment will require CBdb/CBcv alignment
  – 4: list of keywords on page 1
Thank you for your attention